DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 408 245 SP 037 334

AUTHOR	Whitty, Geoff; And Others
TITLE	Teacher Education in England and Wales: Some Findings from the Mote Project.
PUB DATE	Mar 97
NOTE	18p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, March 24-28, 1997).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	British National Curriculum; Competency Based Teacher Education; Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; *Partnerships in Education; *Preservice Teacher Education; *Teacher Competencies; Teacher Education Curriculum; Teacher Participation
IDENTIFIERS	England; *Reform Efforts; Wales

ABSTRACT

Perceptions vary between researchers and the British government as to the adequacy of initial teacher education in England and Wales. Based on the data from the Modes of Teacher Education (MOTE) project the researchers find a higher level of satisfaction from teachers than that claimed by the government. The MOTE project studied the origins, nature, and effects of reforms of initial teacher education in England and Wales between 1991 and 1996. The reforms increased the amount of training carried out in schools, required universities to work in partnership with local schools, and introduced a common list of competencies to be demonstrated by all beginning teachers. Three models of partnership are identified and discussed: collaborative, higher education-led; and separatist. Results from the surveys indicated a high level of school based teacher involvement in course design and interviewing, but course leadership remained the responsibility of university-based tutors. The school-centered initial teacher training (SCITT) run by a consortium of schools, and launched by the British government, was the only program where there was teacher involvement and responsibility. The reforms are considered in light of changes in styles of teacher professionalism. (Contains 26 references.) (SPM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 408 245

TEACHER EDUCATION IN ENGLAND AND WALES:

SOME FINDINGS FROM THE MOTE PROJECT

Geoff Whitty *(Institute of Education)*,
Len Barton *(University of Sheffield)*,
Sheila Miles *(Institute of Education)*,
Caroline Whiting *(University of Exeter)*,
John Furlong *(University of Bristol)*

MODES OF TEACHER EDUCATION PROJECT[1]

Draft of a paper to be presented in a symposium on 'Partnership and Professionalism in Pre-Service Teacher Education' at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, March 24-28, 1997

1 The 'Modes of Teacher Education' (MOTE) project was funded by the Economic and Social Research Council from 1991 to 1996 (Grant Nos R000232810 and R000234185).

SP037334

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

G. J. Whitty

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

TEACHER EDUCATION IN ENGLAND AND WALES:

SOME FINDINGS FROM THE MOTE PROJECT

Geoff Whitty *(Institute of Education)*,
Len Barton *(University of Sheffield)*,
Sheila Miles *(Institute of Education)*,
Caroline Whiting *(University of Exeter)*,
and John Furlong *(University of Bristol)*
(Modes of Teacher Education Project)

Abstract

This paper results from the Modes of Teacher Education (MOTE) project, which studied the origins, nature and effects of the reforms of initial teacher education in England and Wales between 1991 and 1996. The reforms increased the amount of training carried out in schools, required universities to work in partnership with local schools, and introduced a common list of competences to be demonstrated by all beginning teachers. The paper discusses the different sorts of partnerships that have emerged - collaborative, higher education-led and separatist - and considers the likely effects of these reforms and the extent to which they are fostering changing styles of teacher professionalism.

INTRODUCTION

The Modes of Teacher Education (MOTE) project which we commenced in January 1991 was designed to provide a sharper focus to the policy debate about the nature, costs and benefits of initial teacher education. It involved a national survey of the various routes to qualified teacher status in England and Wales at that time and a detailed study of a sample of training courses. These included conventional four year undergraduate [BEd/BA(QTS)] courses, one year postgraduate [PGCE] courses, shortened, lengthened and part-time courses, and school-based articled teacher and licensed teacher schemes. Amongst the project's publications was *Initial Teacher Education in England and Wales: A Topography*, which provided a snapshot of the character of initial teacher education at the start of the decade (Barrett et al 1992). Although the period 1984-1992 had seen major reforms in initial teacher education, our study concluded that, while higher education institutions (HEIs) had sought to 'integrate' sudents' work in the HEI with the world of the school, the formal responsibilities of teachers in the planning and

provision of training had not significantly changed across the system as a whole (Furlong et al 1995).

By the time we began the follow-up project[1], which ran from1993 to 1996, further changes were under way, which sought to alter this state of affairs. Circulars 9/92 for secondary courses and 14/93 for primary courses (DFE 1992; 1993) established a new framework for the relationship between schools and higher education providers in the provision of initial teacher education in England and Wales. Through these circulars, the government insisted that in the future teacher education courses should be planned and run on the basis of a partnership between higher education and schools. For example Circular 9/92 stated that the Government expected that partner schools and HEIs would exercise a joint responsibility for the planning and management of courses and the selection, training and assessment of students'. Students on PGCE courses were expected to spend two-thirds of their time in school. The circular also insisted that HEIs, schools and students should 'focus on the competences of teaching through the whole period of initial training' (DFE 1992). The primary circular insisted on a similar approach, although rather less time had to be spent in school (DFE 1993). The new approach to secondary training had to be implemented by 1994, while the changes to primary training were to be phased in by 1996.

Meanwhile, the government had also launched a school-centred initial teacher training (SCITT) scheme, in which postgraduate teaching training courses can be run by consortia of schools who can choose whether or not to involve HEIs in their training programmes.

MODES OF PARTNERSHIP

In the course of our second study, we saw HEIs and schools developing partnership in various ways. Reflecting on the changes we observed in our sample of courses, we identified three 'ideal typical' models of partnership, which we characterised as 'collaborative partnership', 'HEI-led partnership'; and 'separatist partnership'. It is important to emphasise that these models are indeed ideal typical. Any one actual

---

1 The original 'Modes of Teacher Education' (MOTE) project ran from January 1991 to December 1992 with funding from the Economic and Social Research Council (Grant No R000232810). The follow-up project, which ran from 1993-96, was formally entitled 'Changing Modes of Professionalism? A Case Study of Teacher Education in Transition' (Grant No. R000234185) but the generic title of MOTE continued to be used to encompass the work of both projects.

course could embody elements of more than one model. Indeed, mixed models were not uncommon during the period of transition.

Collaborative partnership

Collaboration is probably the model of partnership that is best known within the literature. It is epitomised by Oxford University's secondary PGCE course. As McIntyre (1990) has argued, at the heart of this model is the commitment to develop a training programme where students are exposed to different forms of educational knowledge, some of which come from school, some of which come from higher education or elsewhere. Teachers are seen as having an equally legitimate, but perhaps different, body of professional knowledge from those in higher education. Students are expected and encouraged to use what they learn in school to critique what they learn within the HEI and vice versa.

HEI-led partnership

The second model of partnership that we identified from our qualitative fieldwork was HEI-led. This model of partnerships was fundamentally different from the collaborative model in that it was indeed led by those in the HEI, though sometimes with the help of a small group of teachers acting as consultants. The aim, as far as course leadership was concerned, was to utilise schools as a resource in setting up learning opportunities for students. Course leaders had a set of aims which they wanted to achieve and this demanded that schools act in similar ways and make available comparable opportunities for all students. Within this model, quality control - making sure students all receive comparable training opportunities - has a high priority.

The motivation for the HEI-led model was either pragmatic or principled. The pragmatic motivation was that local schools were unwilling or unable to take on a greater degree of responsibility for training. Alternatively, course leaders were committed to a model of training that was antithetical to the demands of partnership. They maintained, for example, a strong commitment to introducing students to 'the best' in educational practice within their subject area or to the role of educational theory within ITE. In many such courses, course leaders' aims did not seem to have changed significantly from the past though the means of achieving them certainly had. If an HEI-led vision of training is to be achieved in the new context, then the challenge is how to achieve it within a highly devolved system; schools and teachers have to be drawn into the process of training in a systematic and structured manner.

Separatist partnership

The final model of partnership that was identified from our qualitative fieldwork was a separatist one where school and HEI were seen as having separate and complementary responsibilities but where there was no systematic attempt to bring these two dimensions into dialogue. In other words there was partnership but not necessarily integration in the course: integration was something that students had to achieve for themselves. Interestingly, this is the model of partnership that is put forward within government Circulars 9/92 and 14/93. The vision of the circulars is of a division of labour between schools and HEI rather than integration. Within our sample of courses, it seemed that such a model might emerge either from a principled commitment to allowing schools the legitimacy to have their own distinctive area of responsibility or as a pragmatic response to financial constraints. In practice, the separatist model seemed to be emerging more frequently as a pragmatic response to limited resources.

FORMING PARTNERSHIPS

From our second national survey of courses[2], reported more fully in *Partnership in Initial Teacher Education: A Topography* (Whiting et al 1996), it was clear that, in 1995/96, the majority of courses were operating largely on the HEI-led model of partnership.

The model of partnership that it is possible to establish between an HEI and its local schools clearly depends on the availability of schools willing and able to take on the 'partner' role, however it is defined. Respondents to the survey were asked to state the criteria used by their courses for selecting partner schools. Examples of desired criteria included previous relationships and good track records with students, trained mentor availability and, for secondary courses, suitable subject departments. Primary course leaders often mentioned matching philosophy or ethos within the schools and the HEI and availability of National Curriculum expertise.

These selection criteria were often written into partnership agreements. However, difficulty in recruiting schools meant that they could not always be applied. It is not possible to know from this survey how many schools were actually selected according to the stated criteria, but it may

---

2 211 completed course questionnaires were received from the 280 HEI-led courses, representing a response rate of 75%. 9 out 19 school centred SCITT courses responded to a similar survey, but the results reported here are drawn only from the 211 HEI-led courses.

be significant that the most common criterion of selection cited by respondents was 'willingness' to be a partner and to sign up.

Over a third (35.7%) of the respondent courses reported difficulties in recruiting schools. This difficulty was particularly evident in secondary courses and most pronounced in shortened, part time or conversion courses. This is probably because these courses had a particular subject bias: 44% of them offered maths compared with 16% of conventional postgraduate courses and 39.1% of undergraduate courses. In fact, 20 out of 29 maths courses (69%) reported difficulties in recruiting suitable schools. In addition to problems in maths, difficulties were frequently mentioned in respect of science, technology and modern languages. Art, geography and religious education (RE) were also seen as problematic by some respondents. The point was made, in particular reference to RE, that departments were often small, with no Head of Department.

In some areas, competition from other HEIs had exacerbated problems with placements - sometimes because schools had signed up to a sole partnership with another HEI, sometimes because they were offering better terms. Where there were schools taking students from more than one HEI, it had sometimes caused complications or even withdrawal of partnership. Many secondary course leaders suggested that some schools were unwilling to take on the added responsibility involved in partnership schemes, especially when funding did not reflect the time and effort required. This was expected to apply even more to primary courses and there was concern about what would happen when the fuller partnership model became mandatory in September 1996. Primary schools were often said to be happy with old arrangements and not to want full partnership and the additional responsibilities it implied.

TEACHER INVOLVEMENT

Our survey asked courses leaders whether school-based teachers were involved in a number of aspects of their courses. Teachers were certainly becoming more involved in course design and interviewing, but course leadership remained largely the responsibility of HEI-based tutors on all except the pilot School-Centred Initial Teacher Training (SCITT) courses run by consortia of schools. The only areas in which teachers were seen as having joint or primary responsibility was, unsurprisingly, in the area of school experience. In other areas of teaching, teachers were often involved but, only in secondary main subject application, were they moving towards taking joint responsibility. As for assessment of students, only in practical teaching were teachers taking joint responsibility and, in the case of a few secondary courses, even taking the primary responsibility for it. Teachers still took virtually no role in assessing essays and examination scripts, but did have some

involvement in assessing school-based investigations and the development of curriculum materials. They were however taking joint responsibility for student profiling, especially where this was based on competences.

The overall pattern was therefore one of teacher involvement rather than responsibility, consistent with the HEI-led model of partnership. It is also consistent with the limited amount of training offered to teachers involved in teacher education. Our survey suggested that very few had received more than three days training for their new roles. Given that much of the training was paid for out of special transitional funding, it seems unlikely that this will change in the immediate future.

COURSE OUTCOMES

It has been claimed by the government that half of the students leaving teacher education courses and a similar proportion of headteachers are dissatisfied with their training. This is being used to justify further reforms. Yet, even before the 1992/93 reforms had been fully implemented, we found levels of satisfaction considerably higher than claimed by the government. At the end of the first MOTE project, we had developed three research instruments to provide data about the outcomes of different modes of training. These were:

- an 'Exit' questionnaire administered to students on completion of their training course;
- a 'Newly qualified teacher' (NQT) questionnaire administered at the end of the trainees' first year of teaching'
- a 'Headteacher' questionnaire to be completed by a senior member of staff at the NQT's school at the end of their first year of teaching

Each instrument included a list of 'practical competences' and 'professional understandings'. Respondents were asked to make judgements on a range of professional competences and understandings on a scale of 1-3: well prepared, adequately prepared or poorly prepared. Further items were designed to probe the contribution of the different partners in training to the development of students' practical competences and other professional abilities. Exit questionnaires were distributed to students leaving a sample of initial training courses, stratified by mode of provision, geographical region and institutional sector. Of the 1416 issued from 1992 to 1994, 567 were returned. Of these, 248 were from students trained to be primary teachers and 319 from secondary-trained students.

The data yielded by the survey are particularly interesting in view of the government's proposed national curriculum for ITE (DFEE 1997) and the Secretary of State's claims about the inadequacy of the present arrangements for preparing primary students for the teaching of reading and mathematics. On our Exit questionnaire, 82.5% of finishing primary students reported that they were well or adequately prepared to teach reading. 79.5% said they were well or adequately prepared to teach maths, while as many as 89% said they were well or adequately prepared to teach science. This broadly positive picture is consistent with the analysis of recent inspection reports carried out by the Universities Council for the Education of Teachers (UCET) (Furlong and Kane 1996).

At the end of their first year of teaching the MOTE NQT questionnaire revealed even higher levels of satisfaction in reading and maths. 88% of new primary teachers felt they had been well or adequately prepared to teach reading and 93.5% felt that they had been well or adequately prepared to teach maths. 88% still felt that they had been well or adequately prepared to teach science.

The responses to the Headteacher questionnaire showed that, by and large, headteachers shared this positive evaluation of the competences of new entrants to the profession. 81.5% of primary headteachers felt that their new teachers were well or adequately prepared to teach reading, while 93% felt the same about maths. A startling 98% expressed the view that their new teachers were well or adequately prepared to teach science, probably reflecting the lack of confidence in this field among more experienced teachers.

Finishing students themselves also felt particularly confident in a number of other areas - a majority saying they felt well prepared to use a range of strategies and resources, ensure continuity and progression, maintain motivation and interest, and appraise the effectiveness of their teaching. They did, however, feel significantly less well prepared, both on exit and on reflection a year later, in areas such as teaching children for whom English was a second language, special educational needs (although this concern was not endorsed by headteachers), personal and social education, Information Technology and a number of primary non-core curriculum subjects such as music.

In the Exit questionnaires students were also asked to rate the differential contribution of schools and HEIs to their training on key professional competences and understandings. In relation to 'professional understandings', students reported almost twice as many positive contributions from HEIs as schools. In relation to practical competences, the same divisions did not emerge - both schools and HEIs were seen as making important contributions across a range of competences.

The data also indicated some significant differences between modes of training. For example, students on school-based Articled Teacher courses felt they had less understanding of child development than those on conventional courses, but felt better prepared for talking with parents. Data now being analysed from our1996 exit surveys should indicate whether there have been further changes in the outcomes of conventional courses as they have responded to the government's new requirements. There is clearly a need to collect data in future years to see the full effect of the primary reforms, but unfortunately our own ESRC funding has now come to an end.

Our data clearly have their limitations. They refer only to student, NQT and headteacher perceptions rather than telling us anything directly about the effects of teacher training on pupil outcomes. The response rate, at 40%, was also somewhat disappointing, though similar to that of other recent surveys using a comparable methodology (e.g. Barker et al 1996). However, there is no reason to suppose that disgruntled students would have been less likely to respond to a national survey than satisfied ones. Indeed, recent negative publicity about the quality of teacher training might even have had the opposite effect.

As far as we know, these are the best data on this subject currently available and they are certainly more up-to-date than those cited by the government to demonstrate high levels of dissatisfaction. Even if their figures were correct for the early 1990s, our study would seem to suggest that some significant improvements have already taken place. But even a satisfaction rate of 80% or more is no grounds for complacency. More needs to be done to improve the overall quality of new entrants to teaching, but it is surely best to base this on an accurate assessment of the real scale of the problem.

Nor are our figures necessarily an argument against the proposed national curriculum for primary teacher education. However, they do contain a warning that undue emphasis on English, maths and science could put a further squeeze on work in the very areas in which students already feel least well prepared - e.g. the teaching of children for whom English is a second language, special educational needs and non-core subjects in the primary curriculum. Furthermore, the increased time in school required from primary students from 1996 onwards may make the situation in these areas worse. Certainly, the Articled Teachers in our sample reported less confidence than others in some of these very areas, suggesting that they might not be well covered in school-based training.

IMPLICATIONS FOR TEACHER PROFESSIONALISM

One of the issues with which our research was centrally concerned was what the changes we were seeing implied for the future of teacher professionalism. What, we wondered, were the implications of the shift to school based training and the increased use of competences for definitions of what counts as a professional teacher. In reflecting on these issues, we necessarily move beyond reporting the data, and try to interpret it and extrapolate from it.

It is clear that the British government has been less than enthusiastic about some features of teachers' professional ideologies, particularly the so-called 'trendy child-centred teaching of the 1960s'. A recurring theme in the pamphlets of New Right pressure groups is the need to challenge the liberal educational establishment, which is seen to have been behind the 'progressive collapse' of the English educational system. This educational establishment, dominated by teacher educators, local education authority (LEA) advisers and teaching unions, is seen as prey to ideology and self-interest and no longer in touch with the public.

Strategies for challenging this supposed self-interest of the profession are particularly evident in the government's initial teacher education reforms. The preferred strategy of the neo-liberal marketisers is deregulation of the profession to allow schools to go into the market and recruit graduates (or even non-graduates) without professional training and prepare them on an apprenticeship basis in school. The introduction of new routes into teaching and the strategy of locating more and more elements of training in schools has been partly (though not wholly) influenced by such views.

Deregulation also has some appeal to neo-conservative critics who have detected a collectivist (and even crypto-Marxist) ideological bias among teacher educators in higher education. However, neo-conservatives are still concerned with 'enemies within' the teaching profession as a whole as well as within teacher education. They believe it is 'time to set aside ... the professional educators and the majority of organised teacher unions ... [who] are primarily responsible for the present state of Britain's schools' (Hillgate Group, 1987). Such views, combined with vocationalist concerns about international competitiveness (Hickox 1995), have meant that the government has not pursued a policy of total deregulation or a wholesale devolution of teacher training to the schools.

Instead, it has shown some concern to shape the content of teachers' professional knowledge, initially through the introduction of a common list of competences to be required of beginning teachers, regardless of the nature of the route by which they have achieved them, and more recently by government proposals for a national curriculum for primary teacher

education. This has given rise to the suspicion that the government wants to 'deprofessionalise' teaching by ensuring that, wherever they are trained, teachers focus on the development of craft skills rather than professional understanding.

Stuart Maclure (1993) has suggested that the downgrading of university involvement in teacher education represents an attempt to dismantle the traditional defences of teaching as a profession. Meanwhile, Jones and Moore (1993) argue that an emphasis on competences will serve to undermine the dominant discourse of liberal humanism within the teaching profession and replace it with one of technical rationality. Adams and Tulasiewicz (1995) complain that teachers are being turned into technicians rather than 'reflective professionals'. Such commentators feel that basing training in particular schools can limit the development of broader perspectives on education, and that specifying a limited range of competences will encourage 'restricted' rather than 'extended' professionality (Hoyle 1974). More charitable observers, though, might argue that the government is trying reform teacher education in order to '**re**professionalise' teaching more in line with what it perceives as the needs of the twenty-first century.

Just as in education reform more generally, there seems to have been a dual strategy involving devolution of *some* responsibilities to schools at the same time as prescribing more things from the centre. Schools and teachers may be 'empowered' to develop their own specialisms or 'local' professionalisms and thus compete with one another but only within a very narrow frame. To this extent, the last five years may have seen the erosion of an HEI-led definition of professionalism in initial teacher education, not so much to devolve real responsibility to schools as Hargreaves (1990) and Berrill (1993) might suppose, but to impose an alternative and more restricted state mandated one. The role of the Teacher Training Agency (TTA) established in 1994, and part of the 'quango state', is particularly significant here (Mahony and Hextall 1996). Other potential stakeholders who might foster an alternative collective definition of teacher professionalism, whether HEIs, LEAs, teacher unions or a General Teaching Council (GTC), have been marginalised in the process. This combined use of state control and deregulation to get rid of so-called vested interests is consistent with what Gamble sees as the broader Thatcherite project of creating a 'strong' state and a 'free' economy (Gamble 1988).

But whatever one may think about the motives behind the reforms, we were interested as researchers, both within our fieldwork and our various surveys, in the extent to which the reforms in initial teacher education were actually bringing about changes in the prevailing view of what it meant to be a professional teacher.

THE USE OF COMPETENCES

Both our national surveys asked course leaders whether their courses were designed on the basis of a particular view of teaching that could be articulated and potentially held in common by the various contributors to the course. When asked whether their course was based on any particular model of the teacher, 137 out of 211 course leaders in the 1995/96 survey said 'yes' (65%). This percentage was identical to the response of the 'old' universities at the time of the previous survey, but significantly lower than that obtained from the (then) polytechnics, where the Council for National Academic Awards (CNAA) had a strong influence on such matters.

We were also interested in the extent to which the existence of an official list of competences, which has often been criticised for embodying technical rationality and neglecting more reflective and critical competences, was actually changing the model of the teacher espoused by teacher educators. We found that 46% adhered to the notion of the reflective practitioner compared with 57% at the time of the previous survey. Meanwhile, those specifically espousing the 'competency' model had doubled but only to 11%. So, even if it was somewhat less dominant than it had been five years previously (Barrett et al 1992), 'reflective practice', rather than technical rationality, was still by far the most popular discourse of professionalism within university and college (and indeed school) based courses[3].

Yet, at the same time, the use of competences in courses had increased significantly since the previous survey, well beyond the 11% of courses that explicitly espoused a 'competency' model. Indeed, all secondary courses were required to use them at the time of our latest survey and primary courses were gearing up for the requirement. So how can the use of competences be reconciled with the continuing attachment to the reflective practitioner model?

Our survey showed that only about 8% of courses restricted themselves to using the competences specified in the government circulars, while over 75% had chosen to supplement the official lists with additional competences of their own. This was consistent with our fieldwork which indicated that there was little continuing objection to the idea of competences among course leaders, but only because they felt that reflective competences could be added to the official list in order to

---

3 There are, of course, a number of different interpretations of the concept of reflective practice in teacher education. See Zeichner and Liston (1987) and Hill (1996).

sustain a broader definition of professionality. So course leaders appeared to be able to defend extended notions of professionality while still conforming to government policy.

However, it is also clear from our fieldwork that many of the higher education staff who had taken a leading role in developing reflective competences (e.g. those teaching Foundations, Current Issues, and Teacher as Researcher courses) were amongst those most susceptible to early retirement and casualisation in an era of retrenchment. This has made it difficult for many courses to maintain this work in practice. 'Core' teacher education staff in both higher education and schools are increasingly becoming those concerned with curriculum subjects and classroom management. This means, incidentally, that the staff left in teacher education in HEIs are often those whose skills are closest to those of school-based teachers, thus potentially undermining any claim for a distinctive role for HEIs in teacher education.

Another question on our recent survey asked respondents to choose three words from a list which would best characterise the sort of teacher their course aimed to produce. Despite some resistance to this question, the responses beyond reflective, professional and competent, were quite varied. However, it is noteworthy that some of the terms that New Right critics often associate with HEI-based teacher education - such as child-centredness and critical - were amongst the least popular choices. Unfortunately, we did not have a similar question on the earlier survey to compare this with, but it might suggest a drift towards the more conservative interpretations of reflective practice.

In England, it is also the case that there is a wide variation of practice in schools in relation to many issues with which teacher education has been concerned. For example, a recent report for the Equal Opportunities Commission found 'wide variation amongst schools and LEAs...in the awareness and application of gender issues' (Arnot et al 1996). The shift of more educational and professional studies into schools, with their own 'local' discourses around education, means that treatment of such areas of work in initial teacher education is already becoming highly variable not only across different universities and colleges but also across different partner schools of the same university except where there are strongly collaborative forms of partnership (Furlong et al 1996).

FUTURE TRENDS

So what about the future? In the medium term, there is likely to be increased variation and fragmentation in student experience beyond the rather narrow set of mandated competences. School-based training could mean that we move towards a variety of 'local professionalisms'

(plural) at the margins, with the common elements of teacher professionalism increasingly confined to the officially prescribed competences and the new national curriculum for teacher education. It seems to us, though, that a healthy teaching profession will require continuing efforts to maintain a more broadly defined sense of common professional identity if Maclure's (1993) worst fears are not to be realised. That is not to say that current definitions of teacher professionalism do not need to change, but it is to question the appropriateness of the current combination of restricted and localised forms of professionalism and to hang on to a broader collective view of what it means to be a professional teacher.

While some aspects of this may be fostered through HEIs, teaching unions or a GTC, or some combination of those, this can probably not be whole story as we enter the twenty-first century. We have to recognise that both the state control and market forces strategies are indicative of a 'low trust' relationship between society and its teachers. Media charaterizations of teacher unions often tend to encourage popular suspicion of teachers. Furthermore, the defence of the education service has too often been conducted within the assumptions of the 'old' politics of education, which involved consultation between government, employers and unions but excluded whole constituencies - notably parents and business - to whom the New Right has subsequently successfully appealed (Apple and Oliver 1996). We need to ask some fundamental questions about who has a legitimate right to be involved in defining teacher professionalism.

It is perhaps indicative of the paucity of thinking on this issue that some of the left teacher educators who, twenty years ago, were criticising the elitism of the professions should now be amongst those suggesting that teachers should adopt the modes of self-regulation traditionally associated with the conservative professions of medicine and the law. Are state control, market forces or professional self-governance the only models of accountabiliy - or can we develop new models of teacher professionalism, based upon more participatory relationships with diverse communities ?

In this context, some aspects of the reforms may potentially have their progressive moments. In Australia, for example, Knight et al (1993) argue that devolution can foster a flexibility, diversity and responsiveness which they quite rightly suggest has been largely lacking in teacher education as it has traditionally been conducted. Devolution of decision-making could, they suggest, herald the emergence of what they call 'democratic professionalism', which seeks to demystify professional work and facilitate the participation in decision-making by students, parents and others within the public sphere.

However, the positive consequences of this, which are seen as a real possibility by Knight et al in Australia, seem less likely to be forthcoming on any significant scale in England under present circumstances[4]. Here, 'local' definitions of professionalism exist at the periphery alongside a strong core definition of teacher professionalism based on a restricted notion of professionality - supported by technologies of control that include the official specification of competences, inspection by the Office for Standards in Education (OFSTED), TTA funding decisions, etc. In some ways, the use of such devices may constitute a shift away from conventional techniques of coordination and control on the part of large-scale bureaucratic state forms and their replacement by a set of 'discursive, legislative, fiscal, organisational and other resources' (Rose and Miller 1992, p189). Yet, these apparently 'post-modern' forms not only impact upon organisational subjectivities and professional identities, they also entail some fairly direct modes of control. The extent to which individual schools can challenge them is likely to be both limited and variable.

We can already see in HEIs the ways in which such pressures limit what can be achieved. Thus, while our Topography shows that most course leaders still aspire to deliver extended notions of professionality, as reflected in their extended lists of competences, the changing structural arrangements and the new funding regime are making it ever more difficult to do so. It is fanciful to think that individual schools will really have any greater freedom than universities and colleges.

In that situation, any attempt to develop an alternative approach to teacher education reform, even in a context of globalisation and 'post-modernity', will require the mobilisation of broadly-based national political support and not just professional and local partnerships. The

---

4 The situation elsewhere in the United Kingdom may be somewhat different. Even in Wales, which has introduced similar reforms, the form of the state retains residues of old style 'corporatism', in which there is a degree of commonality in the approach of HEIs and various government departments and agencies (Welsh Office, Her Majesty's Inspectorate, Higher Education Funding Council for Wales, etc). As a consequence, the role of HEIs has remained more significant in ITE than in England. For different reasons, the same is true in Northern Ireland, where the proposal to introduce school-based programmes was successfully resisted by a coalition of religious, professional and political forces. In Scotland, school based teacher education was introduced for one year but then rejected by the teaching profession (Unions and Scottish General Teaching Council) acting in conjunction with HEIs. The form of the state, and the disposition of social and political forces in and around teacher education, has thus led to significant differences in the progress of reform in different parts of the United Kingdom, though none of the reforms really reflects a strong commitment to the development of 'democratic professionalism'.

urgent need is for teacher educators to stop being purely defensive or reactive and begin working with others to develop approaches that relate not only to the legitimate aspirations of the profession but also those of the wider society - and that must include those groups within civil society who have hitherto not been well-served either by the profession or by the state.

References

Adams, A. and Tulasiewicz, W. 1995. *The Crisis in Teacher Education: A European Concern?* London: Falmer Press

Apple, M. W. and Oliver, A. 1996. 'Becoming Right: Education and the formation of conservative movements' in Apple, M. W. *Cultural Politics and Education.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Arnot, M., David, M. and Weiner, G. 1996.*Educational Reforms and Gender Equality in Schools.* Manchester: EOC

Barker, S., Brooks, V., March, K. and Swatton, P. 1996. *Initial Teacher Education in Secondary Schools.* London: Association of Teachers and Lecturers

Barrett et al. 1992. *Initial Teacher Education in England and Wales: A Topography.* London: Modes of Teacher Education Project

Berrill, M. 1993. 'A view from the crossroads'.*Cambridge Journal of Education,* 23

DFE 1992 *Initial Teacher Training (Secondary Phase)* (Circular 9/92) London: Department for Education

DFE 1993 *Initial Teacher Training (Primary Phase)* (Circular 14/93) London: Department for Education

DFEE 1997 *Major shake-up of teacher training.* Press Release. London: Department of Education and Employment, 18 February

Furlong, J. and Kane, I. 1996. *Recognising Quality in Primary ITE.* London: Universities Council for the Education of Teachers

Furlong, J., Whitty, G., Barrett, E., Barton, L., and Miles, S. 1995. 'Integration and Partnership in Initial Teacher Education - dilemmas and possibilities', *Research Papers in Education,* 9(3), pp 281-301

Furlong, J., Whitty, G., Whiting, C., Miles, S., Barton, L. and Barrett, E. 1996. 'Re-defining Partnership: revolution or reform in initial teacher education', *Journal of Education for Teaching,* 22(1), pp 39-55

Gamble, A. 1988. *The Free Economy and the Strong State.* London: Macmillan

Hargreaves, D. 1990. 'Another radical approach to the reform of initial teacher training', *Westminster Studies in Education,* 13

Hickox, M. 1995. 'Situating Vocationalism', British Journal of Sociology of Education, 16(2), pp153-163.

Hill, D. 1996. 'Reflection in teacher education'. in K Watson et al (eds) *Educational Dilemmas: Debate and Diversity. Volume 1: Teacher Education and Training*. London: Cassell

Hillgate Group. 1987. *The Reform of British Education*. London: Claridge Press

Hoyle. E. 1974. 'Professionality, professionalism and control in teaching', *London Education Review*. 3(2)

Jones, L. and Moore, R. 1993. 'Education, competence and the control of expertise'. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*. 14. pp 385-397.

Knight, J., Bartlett, L., and McWilliam, E. (eds) 1993. *Unfinished Business: Reshaping the Teacher Education Industry for the 1990s*. Rockhampton: University of Central Queensland

Maclure, S. 1993. 'Fight this tooth and nail', *The Times Educational Supplement*. 18 June

McIntyre, D. 1990. 'The Oxford Internship Scheme and the Cambridge Analytical Framework: Models of Partnership in Initial Teacher Education', in M. Booth, J. Furlong and M. Wilkin (eds) *Partnership in Initial Teacher Training*. London: Cassell

Mahony, P. and Hextall, I. 1996. 'Trailing the TTA'. Paper delivered at the British Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, University of Lancaster, September 1996

Rose, N. and Miller P. 1992. 'Political power beyond the State: problematics of government', *British Journal of Sociology*. 43(2). pp 173-205

Whiting, C., Whitty, G., Furlong, J., Miles, S. and Barton. L. 1996. *Partnership in Initial Teacher Education: A Topography*. London: Modes of Teacher Education Project

Zeichner, K. and Liston, D. 1987. 'Teaching Student Teachers to Reflect', *Harvard Educational Review*. 57(1). pp 23-48.